UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/532,358	8 04/20/2005 Alagarsamy Sundararajan		WOM-15	1578
26604 KENNETH L. I	7590 02/03/2009 NASH	,	EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 6801			BEACH, THOMAS A	
HOUSTON, TX	X //208-U1U0		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3671	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/03/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/532,3	58	SUNDARARAJAN ET AL.		
		Examine		Art Unit		
		THOMAS	A. BEACH	3671		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communica or Reply	tion appears on the	cover sheet with	n the correspondence ac	ddress	
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL asions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, eply received by the Office later than three months after ad patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF TH FOR 1.136(a). In no everation. The period will apply and well by statute, cause the apply	HIS COMMUNICA ent, however, may a rep ill expire SIX (6) MONTH dication to become ABAI	ATION. Ily be timely filed HS from the mailing date of this of NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status						
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed of This action is FINAL . 2b) Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice	☐ This action is r allowance except	non-final. for formal matter	· •	e merits is	
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)⊠ 8)□ Applicati 9)□	Claim(s) 1-13 and 24-30 is/are pending 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are value Claim(s) 1-13 and 24-28 is/are allowed Claim(s) 29 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 30 is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction on Papers The specification is objected to by the Entre drawing(s) filed on is/are: a	withdrawn from co n and/or election r xaminer.	nsideration. equirement.	v the Examiner		
_	Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to by	on to the drawing(s) be correction is require	pe held in abeyance red if the drawing(s	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).) is objected to. See 37 C		
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notic 3) Inforr	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO- nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	-948)	Paper No(s)/	mmary (PTO-413) Mail Date ormal Patent Application -		

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dare et al 4,215,749 alone. Dare shows lightweight subsea intervention package for use in servicing a subsea well, said subsea well comprising at least one of a vertical Christmas tree or a horizontal Christmas tree, said subsea intervention package being operable for containing said subsea well while using at least one of tubing, coiled tubing, or wireline during said servicing of said subsea wells, said subsea intervention package having a lower package 14 attachable to said subsea well regardless of whether said subsea well comprises said vertical Christmas tree or said horizontal Christmas tree, said lower package comprising at least two hydraulically actuated gate valves 52 (fig 1), at least one of said at least two hydraulically actuated gate valves being operable for cutting 90 said tubing (fig 2-3), coiled tubing, or wireline and then closing to form a seal for sealing said subsea well, at least one of said at least two hydraulically actuated gate valves is operable for repeated severing of tubulars of at least 2 3/4 inches without need for maintenance, said lower package weighs between ten and thirty tons, and said lower package defining a bore through said at least two hydraulically actuated gate valves (fig

Application/Control Number: 10/532,358 Page 3

Art Unit: 3671

1-3). Dare does not disclose the specific dimensions and weight of claim 29 including two hydraulically actuated gate valves which is greater than seven inches, tubulars of at least 2 ¾ inches or lower package weighs between ten and thirty tons; however, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to modify the Dare to include the ranges of since applicant has not disclosed that these ranges solve any particular problem or purpose and it appears other similar ranges would work equally well. Furthermore, routine experimentation would lead one of ordinary skill in the art to these ranges.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 2. Claims 1-13 and 24-28 are allowed.
- 3. Claim 30 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 11/04/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments regarding Dare not showing a lower package attachable to subsea well "regardless of whether said subsea well comprises a vertical Christmas tree or horizontal" are noted. They are not persuasive since they amount to functional language that does not result in a patentable distinction. This recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the

claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

Applicant's arguments regarding the "long term failure of the art" to disclose dimension and weights of elements are not based in fact since no evidence has been presented. The increase of a pipe tubular from 2" to 2 3/4" is not dramatic as applicant has argued. Furthermore, Dare describes a 2" tubular by way of example, ("such as"), but does not state anywhere in the patent that a slightly larger tubular cannot be utilized, or that this apparatus is only limited to this size.

Applicant's arguments noted KSR are noted; however, mere routine skill in the art would be able to have the opening (which appears to be able to handle a 2 3/4" tubular, see figure 6) and cutter function with these weight and dimension limitations.

Applicant's 4th argument regarding Dare not being capable of cutting tubing other than "macaroni" is inaccurate since Dare specifically states that it can and is used to cut "large diameter tubing 46" in columns 4 & 5, lines 66-67 & 1-2, respectively.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Page 5

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas A. Beach whose telephone number is 571.272.6988. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Will can be reached on 571.272.6998. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571.273.8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/532,358 Page 6

Art Unit: 3671

Thomas A. Beach

/Thomas A Beach/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3671

February 3, 2009

THOMAS A. BEACH Primary Examiner Group 3600